

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 16, 2004, claims 1-20 and 23-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Murata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,402; hereinafter "Murata"); and claims 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata. The foregoing rejections and objections are respectfully traversed.

At page 4 of the Action, the Examiner takes Official Notice that "translating email data from a source language to a target language is well known in the art and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include it in the teachings of Murata teaching. However, the Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's Official Notice.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 3, 5, 11, 13-26, 29, 31-32, 36 and 38-39 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 27, 28, 30, 33-35 and 37 have been amended. Specifically, the limitations of claim 5 have been incorporated into claims 1, 2, 27, 28, 34 and 35, and the limitations of claim 11 have been incorporated into claim 9. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-10, 12, 27, 28, 30, 33-35, 37 and 40 are pending and under consideration.

Murata fails to discuss a relay device "wherein the request data comprises an identifier specifying a request target, and said caching unit is accessed based on the identifier..." as recited in amended claims 1, 2, 27, 28, 34 and 35.

Further, Murata fails to discuss a terminal device comprising "...a display unit displaying information, wherein the information before being translated and the translated information are displayed in a side-by-side translation format in which the information is arranged with respect to predetermined portions thereof..." as recited in amended claim 9.

Instead, FIG. 4 of Murata discusses a document retrieval and display system for retrieving source documents in different languages from servers linked by a communication network, translating the documents as necessary, storing the translated documents and selecting whether to display the source document or a translated document at the client device (see abstract and column 2, line 62 – column 3, line 9).

Further, Murata fails to discuss a method and a computer readable medium for implementing a method of translating text information into a language specified "...wherein a part or the whole of the document data in the process of being edited is translated into the language specified," as recited in claims 33 and 40, respectively.

Moreover, dependent claims 4, 6-8, 10, 12, 30 and 37 recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. For example, claim 8/1 recites "the request data from a plurality of

terminal devices are relayed, and the translated result is transmitted as response data to said terminal device of a sender of the request data".

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

Feb 16, 2005

By:



Deidre M. Davis

Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501